



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,962	11/30/2000	Eshwar Pittampalli	14-1	1700

22046 7590 11/03/2004

LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.
DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
101 CRAWFORDS CORNER ROAD - ROOM 3J-219
HOLMDEL, NJ 07733

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, SIMON

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2685

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/726,962

Applicant(s)

PITTAMPALLI ET AL.

Examiner

SIMON D NGUYEN

Art Unit

2685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 7/16/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hellander (6,445,918) in view of Lee et al. (6,667,962).

Regarding claim 1, Hellander discloses a method for recovery a call between a wireless unit and a mobile communication system (figs.1-4, abstract), comprising the steps of: after having lost communication between the wireless unit and a first set of base stations servicing the call, changing from the first set of base stations to a second set of base stations, independent of the wireless communication system and based on information known to be at both the wireless unit and the wireless communications system before the communications between the wireless unit and the first set of serving base stations is lost such that the second set of base stations is established both at the wireless communication system and the wireless unit without requiring communication between the first set of serving base stations and the wireless unit, to recover the call; and communicating with the second set of serving base stations to continue the call (column 5 line 37 to column 6 line 32, column 6 line 49 to column 8 line 17). However,

Art Unit: 2685

Hellander does not specifically disclose the step of automatically established without requiring communication between the wireless unit and the system.

Lee, in the same field of invention, discloses a wireless unit automatically established a connection from a first set of BS to a second set of BS without requiring communication between a network and the wireless unit (column 4 lines 5-68).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have Hellander, modified by Lee in order to reduce the time required to recover a dropped call.

Regarding claim 6, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1, wherein the reconnection is generated by the mobile station (column 6 line 5-15).

Regarding claims 2, 7, Hellander further discloses a step of using a channel (a control channel having an acceptable signal strength from the previously made MAHO measurements) which can be determined at both the wireless communication system and at the wireless unit before, the communication is lost between the wireless unit and the first set of serving base station to receive communications from the at least one of the second set of base station after the communication is lost with the first set of serving base station (column 6 lines 5-15).

Regarding claims 11-12, these claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, wherein processing circuitries are inherently in both the communication system and the wireless unit.

Art Unit: 2685

3. Claims 3-5, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hellander (6,445,918) in view of Lee et al. (6,667,962) and further in view of Padovani et al. (6,151,502).

Regarding claims 3-5, 8-10, in the modified Hellander, Hellander further discloses that after communication between the wireless unit and the first set of serving base station (a first RBS) is lost, a neighboring cell list (candidate list) identified with a previous control channel having an acceptable signal strength, as determined from previously made MAHO measurements reported to the system before the communication is lost to establish to the second set of base station (a second BS) to reconnect the call, wherein the second RBS inherently becomes an active base station from the neighboring list (column 5 line 62 to column 6 line 32) and wherein the wireless unit receives a channel assignment message over a predetermined control channel from a the second set of base station (column 5 line 36 to column 6 line 31, column 7 line 1 to column 8 line 17). It should be noted that the second RBS is previously selected based on a control channel having an acceptable signal strength, made from MAHO measurement which is obvious a pilot signal measurement message. However, the modified Hellander does not specifically a pilot strength measurement message.

Padovani discloses a method for recovery a call between a wireless unit (mobile station) and a mobile communication system (fig.2, column 2 lines 4-5) wherein an active set or candidate set of base stations are selected based on pilot strength measurement message (column 3 lines 22-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have Hellander, modified

Art Unit: 2685

by Padovani to use a pilot strength measurement message in the determination of connecting a mobile station to a new set of base station in order to improve the system performance in recovery of a dropped call.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6, 11, 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding arguments to a newly added limitation in claims 1, 6, 11, and 12, Lee discloses a wireless unit automatically establish a connection to a new set of BS without communication with the network (see the above rejection).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2685

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Simon Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-1116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban, can be reached on (703) 305-4385.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II,
2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Simon Nguyen

11/01/04

Simon Nguyen